

ATTACHMENT 6 – PROJECTS OF CONCERN
EVALUATION FORMS

NOVEMBER 17, 2006

**2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final)
Individual Project Comments Form**

Lead Entity: Island County
Project Sponsor: Island County of
Project Name: Strawberry Point Protection Assessment
Project Number: 06-2217N
Project Location: Stawberry Point nearshore on the East side of Whidbey Island northeast of Oak Harbor (site is between Crescent Bay and Dugualla Bay).
Project Type: Non-capital (assessment)

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The sponsor met the conditions of the Review Panel and the scope of work was revised so the project focus is limited to private lands. The budget has decreased accordingly.

2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final) Individual Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap County
Project Sponsor: Bainbridge Island City of
Project Name: Pritchard Park East Bluff
Project Number: 06-2294R
Project Location: Bluff shoreline just south of the Wyckoff EPA Superfund site at the entrance to Eagle Harbor, Bainbridge Island
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

In general, removal of bulkheads to allow for natural erosion of feeder bluffs in this part of Puget Sound where the majority of shoreline is armored is a high priority activity for regional salmon recovery.

The sponsor provided information and multiple photos of the bulkhead and the beach in front of the sheet piling to show restoration potential of the nearshore processes. The sponsor also provided additional information that the beach directly in front of the bulkhead removal site is a WDFW documented surf smelt spawning beach. While the SRFB does not fund monitoring as part of project proposals, the Review Panel hopes that the project site will be monitored for surf smelt activity once the project is complete.

**2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final)
Individual Project Comments Form**

Lead Entity: **San Juan Co Comm Dev LE**
Project Sponsor: **KWIAHT (Russel Barsh)**
Project Name: **Juvenile salmon food security on Waldron**
Project Number: **06-2270N**
Project Location: **Waldron Island**
Project Type: **Non-capital (assessment)**

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

15. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.

We appreciate the applicant's identification of restoration projects that may be promoted as a result of this assessment, however we believe the technical information already exists to support implementing these projects. In addition, the Review Panel believes that the study portion of the work will not lead to major information gains oriented at the scientific aspects of project development or sequencing, and that the project is geared mostly toward community outreach.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The Review Panel believes this is a valuable landowner outreach and education effort on Waldron Island and encourages the applicant to seek alternative funding such as the San Juan County Community Salmon Fund. Alternatively the applicant could sponsor one or more of the restoration projects listed in the supplemental information.

The project's ability to provide information on a specific site's contribution to salmon stomach contents may be overstated, although the work will provide some information on the topic. The interpretation of the role of littoral processes on salmon prey availability is overly ambitious about possible micro-habitat differences that may be detected in the project particularly in light of only one year of sampling.

The research questions that would begin to be addressed by the study would be better addressed by a larger scale, longer-term study due to the anticipated spatial and temporal variability of the datasets proposed for collection. This is a particularly challenging situation for WRIA 2, the project sponsor, and the Review Panel, because such a research project would probably be costly, and may not meet current SRFB eligibility requirements despite the fact that addressing data gaps is a top priority identified in the WRIA 2 strategy as part of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, and has been supported by the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team.

**2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final)
Individual Project Comments Form**

Lead Entity: San Juan County Community Development
Project Sponsor: Northwest Marine Tech Inc
Project Name: Juvenile Chinook-Spatial and Temporal
Project Number: 06-2293N
Project Location: Shoal Bay, Neck Point Covers, and Glenwood Springs Hatchery
Project Type: Non-capital (assessment)

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The sponsor has identified specific projects that will result from the study component of the project and clarified the linkages and justification for carrying out both the study component of the project and the restoration design. We feel the availability of data collected in the past is reasonably sufficient to begin to implement protection and/or restoration projects.

The sponsor has grappled with filling a data gap identified in the Lead Entity strategy while meeting the eligibility criteria of the SRFB for non-capital projects. The applicant addressed the Review Panel's comments, which were focused on de-emphasizing the project's research component and emphasizing the project development component.

The study portion of the project begins to address important research questions; however, these questions would be better addressed by a larger-scale, longer-term study. This is a particularly challenging situation for WRIA 2, the project sponsor, and the Review Panel, because such a research project would probably be costly, and may not meet current SRFB eligibility requirements despite the fact that addressing data gaps is the top priority identified in the WRIA 2 strategy as part of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, and has been supported by the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team.

2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final) Individual Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: San Juan County Community Development
Project Sponsor: San Juan County
Project Name: San Juan Protection Initiative
Project Number: 06-2291N
Project Location: Entire San Juan County
Project Type: Non-capital (assessment)

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

To meet the SRFB's review criteria the Review Panel asked that the applicant provide documentation explaining precisely how the project activities will achieve the desired objectives.

Detailed responses to the following specific questions posed by the Review Panel were received:

1. The application should clearly explain why existing regulations and planning processes are unable to adequately protect salmon habitat in WRIA 2. Which regulations and programs will be reviewed as part of this proposal? What are some examples of conflicting directives between regulatory programs? Why aren't existing processes, such as the MRC in its dual salmon recovery and marine resources planning roles, effective? Would this proposed process replace any existing programs? How might existing regulatory programs be amended to include voluntary, incentive-based elements and how would these incentives be implemented within the context of the local government's staff and budget resources?
2. The application should explain in more detail how the results of past and current WRIA 2 nearshore protection activities will be evaluated for effectiveness. What criteria will be used to measure "effectiveness?"
3. While the proposal lists six "Project Objectives," these tend to read more like general "mission statements" than tangible outputs, and it is difficult to understand precisely what deliverables the project intends to produce. Elsewhere, the proposal states that the project will "...seek to deliver a package of programs that work in concert to meet community and ecological needs." What specifically will this "package" include? It is inferred from the large GIS budget that the package will include some kind of mapping. Will this map prioritize

specific geographic areas for different kinds of protection? Will there be site-specific prioritized projects in addition to the package of programs?

4. The “Project Approach” includes convening a “Policy Leadership Group” and a “Technical Team” to advise and hopefully guide the eventual implementation of the project results. What will the process be for recruiting these teams? Who are the key stakeholders that will be represented and how will the teams be structured to balance diverse community interests? If the current MRC, with its diverse community constituency, and the county’s local political process itself have not been effective enough in achieving buy-in from stakeholders and producing salmon recovery results, what will the two new committees do differently to achieve the desired outcomes? What measures will the project take to help ensure that recommendations proposed by the policy and technical groups actually become implemented in county governance?
5. What exactly are the proposed responsibilities of the technical coordinator position? The application states that the position will coordinate GIS overlays and communicate the technical team’s findings to the public. It is not clear how these activities justify a full-time staff person, given that existing local stakeholders already have GIS capabilities and that the project also includes a large budget for external consulting assistance. If the technical capacity of existing stakeholders is lacking, what specific steps will the project take to improve it and ensure that it is sustainable after the project ends? Please elaborate on the duties of this position and why it is necessary for the success of the project.

4. Other comments.

The Review Panel found this to be a unique project and much time was required to evaluate it. It was especially challenging to apply the SRFB’s project review criteria, which do not appear to be designed for projects like this one.

The Review Panel does not question the laudable objectives of the project. The project may well represent an appropriate new approach to address the issues identified by the sponsor in San Juan County. However, there are many uncertainties about whether the project will realize its objectives, and from a SRFB perspective, lead to actual protection projects beyond what might be doable via ongoing mechanisms.

**2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final)
Individual Project Comments Form**

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Asotin Conservation District
Project Name: Shumaker Creek Passage Barrier Project
Project Number: #06-2232R
Project Location: Shumaker Creek, a tributary to Grand Ronde River
Project Type: Restoration (fish passage)

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The Review Panel is concerned fish access to and habitat above the upper culvert has not been confirmed nor assessed. The WDFW Watershed Steward for the Snake River area explained to the Review Panel that the agency is planning to survey habitat conditions in Shumaker Creek including fish presence in the spring of 2007.

Condition:

1. The upper culvert element of the project shall only be completed upon confirmation by WDFW that steelhead juveniles do access the culvert; and
2. The WDFW survey identifies sufficient habitat quantity and quality above the culvert to warrant correcting the barrier.

SRFB staff, the local TAG, and the WDFW Watershed Steward will review the fish use survey results and collectively determine whether satisfactory conditions exist to complete the upper barrier project.

4. Other comments.

2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final) Individual Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Tri-State Steelheaders
Project Name: Kooskooskie Conservation Easement
Project Number: #06-2240A
Project Location: Mill Creek, a tributry to the Walla Walla River
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The Review Panel was initially concerned because the original proposal was for protection of mostly upland habitat,. Of the 11-acre parcel, 3.8-acres are considered riparian habitat. Further, the threat to habitat function appears minimal even if the parcel is developed.

The applicant, however, has revised the SRFB portion of the project to protect only the riparian area via Conservation Easement. The proposed easement will protect one-quarter mile of creek (both sides). The easement will extend 200 feet from the riverbank on the left and to the county right-of-way on the right bank (+/-50 feet from the bank).

4. Other comments.

2006 SRFB Review Panel Individual Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan Co/Colville Tribe
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: Redshirt Barrier Removal
Project Number: 06-2269R
Project Location: Beaver Creek, tributary to the Methow River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The Review Panel would have found a conceptual drawing/diagram to be very helpful in understanding the layout of the project. The applicant is encouraged to provide this in future applications.

4. Other comments

This project will address the last partial barrier on Beaver Creek and potentially benefit steelhead and bull trout. The project will minimize future riparian disturbance by piping water.

2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final) Individual Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 1 (Nooksack)
Project Sponsor: Lummi Indian Business Council
Project Name: SF 30 Mile Instream Habitat Restoration
Project Number: 06-2259R
Project Location: South Fork (SF) Nooksack River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Ballasted logjams in a mid-channel environment, particularly in this incised, high energy system with large boulder substrate, have less certainty of achieving the stated objectives. The project proposes to treat 3,700 lineal feet of the South Fork Nooksack channel with ballasted LWD "roughened channel elements."

Condition:

Remove "ballasted wood structures" from the proposal as they relate to mid-channel placement.

4. Other comments.

This reach of the South Fork contains only one of three Chinook spawning areas on the river, and is the highest accessible reach in the watershed, so has a high priority rating.

2006 SRFB Review Panel (Final) Individual Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima Basin FWRB
Project Sponsor: Yakima County of
Project Name: Naches River Floodplain Acquisition
Project Number: 06-2193A
Project Location: Naches River, tributary to the Yakima River
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual #18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y N
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The three properties that are proposed for acquisition are in the proper sequence and will protect existing high quality main-stem habitat in the Naches River. The Wells property has been substituted for a 15-acre parcel known as the Rassmussen, and the budget has been adjusted accordingly.